

1 Eric J. Kiley, OSB # 025802
2 Associate General Counsel
3 SELCO Community Credit Union
4 1050 High Street
5 Eugene, OR 97401
6 Telephone: (541) 686-5356
7 Facsimile: (541) 686-5356
8 ekiley@selco.org
9 Of Attorneys for SELCO Community
10 Credit Union

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**
21 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

22
23
24
25 In re: Chapter 11
LEHMAN BROTHER HOLDINGS INC., et al., Case No. 08-13555 (SCC)
Debtors

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1

1 **COMES NOW SELCO** Community Credit Union (hereinafter “SELCO”), an
2 Oregon State Chartered Credit Union, by and through its Associate General Counsel, Eric J.
3 Kiley, and Objects to Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc.’s (hereinafter “LBHI”) Second Motion
4 in Aid of Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures Order for Indemnification Claims of
5 the Debtors Against Mortgage Loan Sellers (hereinafter “Second Motion”). SELCO files
6 this objection with a pending motion before the court for *pro hac vice* admission of its
7 Counsel, Eric J. Kiley, in order to meet the filing deadline of May 3, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.
8 (Eastern Standard Time).
9

10 For the reasons provided in the Memorandum in Support below, SELCO contends
11 that LBHI’s Second Motion is fatally flawed, and therefore should not require SELCO, who
12 is not a party to this adversary proceeding, to participate in costly and time consuming
13 mediation for a matter in which LBHI has produced no admissible evidence that SELCO
14 should have any involvement in the ADR process associated with this adversary proceeding.

15 **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

16 **INTRODUCTION**

17 SELCO is a credit union based in Eugene, Oregon. Although LBHI admittedly
18 “cannot conclusively determine the existence of successor liability”, they baldly assert that
19 SELCO is a potential successor in interest to Frontier Investment Company (hereinafter
20 “Frontier”), because SELCO “continued Frontier’s mortgage lending operations” and
21 “[o]ne or more officers and managers of Frontier are now listed as employees of SELCO.”
22 Second Motion, Exhibit A p. 2. LBHI now seeks an order requiring SELCO participate in
23 mandatory mediation with LBHI, at SELCO’s own expense and despite the fact that LBHI
24

25 **Page 2 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.’S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 has not presented even a modicum of admissible evidence to indicate SELCO is a
2 successor in interest to Frontier. SELCO is not named as a defendant in this adversary
3 proceeding, and has no relationship, contractual or otherwise, with LBHI regarding their
4 claims in the underlying adversary proceeding, and thus has no ability to mount a
5 meaningful defense to LBHI's claims or to have any basis for negotiating settlement in the
6 ADR process.

7 LBHI's Second Motion, like its First Motion in Aid of Alternative Dispute
8 Resolution Procedures Order for Indemnification Claims of the Debtors Against Mortgage
9 Loan Sellers (hereinafter "First Motion"), ignores due process, jurisdictional requirements,
10 violates procedural rules, and would require entities that were never in privity with LBHI
11 to expend significant resources to mediate based solely on LBHI's inaccurate and wholly
12 unsubstantiated assertions that the entities listed *may* be a *potential* successor in interest to
13 the named Defendants in the adversary proceeding.

15 FACTS

16 1. On May 29, 2014, LBHI, the Plan Administrator, filed a Motion for
17 Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures Order for Indemnification Claims of the
18 Debtor's Against Mortgage Loan Sellers which was granted by the court on July 18, 2014
19 (the Order granting that motion hereinafter referred to as "ADR Order.") (Docket Nos.
20 44450 and 45277 respectively).

21 2. The ADR Order requires, *inter alia*, that the banks and other mortgage
22 lending institutions from which LBHI or its affiliates purchased mortgage loans
23 (hereinafter collectively the "Sellers") be compelled to negotiate with LBHI a potential
24

25 **Page 3 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.'S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 resolution of LBHI's indemnity claims through participation in mandatory mediation.

2 Participation requires Sellers to appear in person in New York City, and subjects them to
3 sanctions if they refuse to participate. (Docket No. 45277).

4 3. On October 22, 2015, LBHI filed its First Motion. In that First Motion,
5 LBHI claims that some Sellers have been uncooperative or refused to participate in
6 mediation as required by the ADR Order. LBHI named numerous new entities, who were
7 never listed as defendants, and asked the court to extend the ADR Order to require any
8 named successors in interest to participate in mediation or face sanctions. (Docket No.
9 51241).

10 4. On October 16, 2015, three Objections to the First Motion were filed
11 (hereinafter collectively "First Objections".) Similar arguments were brought in each of the
12 First Objections. (Docket Nos. 51459, 51462, and 51464).

13 5. On December 1, 2015, the Court filed its Order in Aid of Alternative
14 Dispute Resolution Procedures Order for Indemnification Claims of the Debtor's Against
15 Mortgage Loan Sellers (hereinafter "First Order"), with the exception that the entities that
16 filed the First Objections were excluded from the definition of "Successors" for purposes
17 of the First Motion. (Docket No. 51575).

18 6. On April 22, 2016, LBHI filed its Second Motion, seeking to adhere the
19 ADR Order to a new list of alleged successors in interest to the Sellers. (Docket No.
20 52574). SELCO is listed in Exhibit A to the Second Motion as a successor to Frontier.

21 ///

22
23
24
25 Page 4 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.'S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS

1 **REQUESTED RELIEF**

2 SELCO hereby respectfully requests that the Court deny the Second Motion as to
3 SELCO. Alternatively, SELCO requests that the Court exclude SELCO from the definition
4 of "Successors" as used in the Second Motion, in the same manner that the Court did for
5 the Objectors to the First Motion in its First Order.

6 **ARGUMENT**

7 **The Second Motion Violates Due Process, Lacks Jurisdiction, and Fails to State a
8 Claim**

9 SELCO is not and has never been a party to this action. SELCO was not served
10 with a summons and complaint. SELCO is not listed as a defendant in any proceeding
11 brought by LBHI. Rather, LBHI is now attempting to force SELCO into costly mediation
12 by naming it in an exhibit to a motion on baseless and bald assertions that SELCO *might*
13 be a *potential* successor to a business that has been dissolved for eight years. LBHI
14 presents no colorable evidence that SELCO is a successor in interest, instead opting to
15 guess at whether it meets a strict exception to the successor liabilities laws without so
16 much as providing a declaration that it has reason to believe the "facts" it sets forth have
17 merit.

18 SELCO has never had a contractual relationship with LBHI in relation to this
19 proceeding, nor has LBHI provided even a shred of evidence that SELCO has any
20 obligation to LBHI, contractual or otherwise. Not only is it inequitable to force SELCO to
21 expend significant costs and resources to prove it is not a successor in interest, this
22 attempted shift in the burden of proof is unsupported by case law. This attempt by LBHI
23

24 **Page 5 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.'S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
25 ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 to bootstrap SELCO into an ADR agreement simply by mentioning it in an exhibit to a
2 motion is a meritless position that would result in significant costs to SELCO based on
3 nothing more than mere allegations with no admissible evidence introduced to justify such
4 an action.

5 Federal courts do not have inherent jurisdiction. Until an action has been
6 commenced, federal district courts have no jurisdiction to act. *In re Market Basket, Inc.*,
7 122 F. Supp. 321, 322 (W.D. Mo. 1954) (interpreting Rule 3, Fed. R. Civ. P.); *see also In*
8 *re Marion*, Case No. 05-67816 JPK, 2006 Bankr. LEXIS 4231, at *13 (Bankr. N.D. Ind.
9 May 1, 2006) (“Absent the filing of a valid initiating document, a federal court has no
10 jurisdiction with respect to anything[.]”). LBHI filed an adversary proceeding in which
11 Frontier is listed as a defendant. Thus, the Court has jurisdiction over Frontier, but LBHI
12 has not established that the court has jurisdiction over SELCO who is not a named party to
13 this proceeding.

14 The burden is on LBHI to establish that SELCO is a successor in interest to
15 Frontier. *Call Center Technologies, Inc. v. Grand Adventures Tour & Travel Pub. Corp.*,
16 635 F.3d 48, 52 (2nd Cir. 2011) (“the proponent of successor liability must offer proof that
17 one of the . . . exceptions to the general rule [that purchasers of assets do not assume their
18 predecessor’s liabilities] applies.”) However, LBHI includes no evidence whatsoever,
19 admissible or otherwise, that SELCO is a successor in interest to Frontier. In fact, LBHI
20 admits it “cannot conclusively determine the existence of successor liability.” Second
21 Motion at ¶ 22. Rather, LBHI points to “indicia giving rise to reasonable grounds to assert
22 that the Successors *may* be legally responsible.” *Id (emphasis added)*.

23
24
25 **Page 6 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.’S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 At no time does LBHI indicate how it came to this “reasonable” conclusion. At no
2 point does it assert that the “indicia” specific to SELCO is sufficient to establish liability.
3 Rather, LBHI seeks to have SELCO expend time and expense to travel to New York to
4 prove in mediation that SELCO is not liable as a successor. This burden shift is
5 unsupported by any factual allegations or case law, and the “indicia” listed specific to
6 SELCO is both inaccurate and inconsequential to establish liability.
7

8 LBHI fails to even file a declaration stating under oath that the assertions have
9 some basis in truth, or were the product of firsthand knowledge. Quite simply, there is no
10 evidence in the record to support LBHI’s claim that SELCO is a successor in interest to
11 Frontier.

12 **The Second Motion Fails to State Facts Sufficient to Establish Successor Liability
13 Under Oregon State Law**

14 Even if LBHI’s Second Motion somehow survives its many procedural failings,
15 LBHI has failed to allege any fact which under Oregon law would open SELCO to
16 successor liability. The first and only mention of SELCO, or allegation that it is a
17 successor, can be found in Exhibit 1 to the Second Motion, which reads:

18 Information obtained by LBHI indicates the following: The original entity,
19 Frontier, was acquired by and operated as a wholly owned subsidiary of SELCO.
20 Although Frontier eventually dissolved, SELCO and/or another of its subsidiaries
21 continued Frontier’s mortgage lending operations. One or more officers and
managers of Frontier’s are now listed on the SELCO website as part of its
mortgage team.

22 Even taken at face value, this brief paragraph fails to allege sufficient facts to
23 establish successor liability under Oregon law. It appears that LBHI is asserting SELCO is
24

1 a mere continuation of Frontier. Even a cursory review of successor liability law in Oregon
2 would have alerted LBHI to the fact that operational continuity alone does not establish
3 liability. Additionally, LBHI's unsubstantiated claims of continuity of management falls
4 far short of case law cited by LBHI defining the "mere continuation" exception.

5 Oregon follows the traditional rule of successor liability; when one corporation
6 transfers all of its assets to another, the latter is not liable for the debts and liabilities of the
7 other. *Erikson v. Grande Ronde Lbr. Co.*, 162 Or. 556, 568 (Or, 1939) *see also Gonzalez v.*
8 *Standard Tools and Equipment Co.*, 270 Or. App. 394, 397 (Or, 2015). Oregon recognizes
9 only the four basic exceptions to this rule:

10 1) Where the purchaser expressly or impliedly agrees to assume such debts; (2)
11 where the transaction amounts to a consolidation or merger of the corporations; (3)
12 where the purchasing corporation is merely a continuation of the selling
13 corporation; and (4) where the transaction is entered into fraudulently in order to
escape liability for such debts. *Id.*

14 Oregon has explicitly and repeatedly refused to adopt the product line exception. See
15 *Dahlke v. Cascade Acoustics Inc.*, 171 P.3d 992, 998 (Or., 2007); *Gonzalez*, 270 Or App at
16 398. Thus, a successor company which continues to produce the same type of product as
17 the original company does not assume successor liability under Oregon law. *Gonzalez*, 270
18 Or App at 398-399.

19 LBHI never asserts that SELCO impliedly or expressly assumed Frontier's debts.
20 LBHI never asserts that SELCO expressly or *de facto* merged with Frontier. LBHI never
21 asserts that SELCO entered into a fraudulent transfer with Frontier. The closest to an actual
22

23
24
25 **Page 8 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.'S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 allegation that SELCO in any way meets an exception to the general rule of successor
2 liability is under the “mere continuation” exception.

3 LBHI asserts that SELCO “continued Frontier’s mortgage lending operations.”
4 This assertion is untrue, and unsubstantiated. Additionally, because Oregon has expressly
5 rejected the product line exception, the mere fact that the surviving entity produces the
6 same “product” as the entity that dissolved does not establish successor liability. *See*
7 *Gonzalez*, 270 Or App at 398.
8

9 LBHI seeks to mislead the court that there was significant continuity of managers
10 or employees between SELCO and Frontier, enough to make SELCO a “mere
11 continuation” of Frontier. This is not the case. The best LBHI does is claim “[o]ne or more
12 officers and managers of Frontier’s are now listed on the SELCO website as part of its
13 mortgage team.” LBHI does not elaborate, does not cite the names of any single officer,
14 manager or employee or if they’re in the same or similar positions. LBHI fails to even cite
15 the web page it references.

16 According to LBHI’s Second Motion, the “mere continuation” exception applies
17 “when the corporation merely changes its corporate form, but otherwise continues
18 operations with the same management and shareholders.” Second Motion ¶ 35. Based on
19 the case law LBHI cites, it applies “where purchaser had essentially same management and
20 employees as seller, produced and sold similar product, used same facility, and selling
21 corporation was dissolved.” *Id.* at 36, *citing Fiber-Lite Corp. V. Molded Acoustical*
22 *Products of Easton, Inc.*, 186 B.R. 603, 609 (E.D. Pa 1994).
23

24
25 **Page 9 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.’S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 As LBHI states, Frontier was dissolved, however LBHI does not assert that
2 Frontier and SELCO ever shared a facility, nor did they. Frontier and SELCO both made
3 mortgages, however, as stated above, the product line exception has expressly been
4 rejected in Oregon, so that fact is irrelevant on its own to establish liability. Thus, LBHI
5 must be asserting that because “one or more officers and managers of Frontier are now
6 listed on the SELCO website as part of its mortgage team,” eight years after Frontier
7 dissolved, there is “essentially the same management and employees.”
8

9 LBHI makes no mention of who these alleged employees are, what positions they
10 held at either company, when they were hired by SELCO, or when they ceased working for
11 Frontier. The mere fact that at least one person who worked at Frontier happens to have
12 taken a position in their chosen field at SELCO, at some point in the past eight years since
13 Frontier dissolved, in no way establishes “essentially the same management and
14 employees.” Both SELCO and Frontier were centered in Eugene, Oregon. Eugene is a
15 small town with a small financial industry. It is not uncommon for persons to work at more
16 than one company throughout their career. Absent significantly more factual allegations,
17 LBHI’s assertions are wholly insufficient to show a continuity of management or
18 employees sufficient to establish successor liability under the mere continuation exception.
19

CONCLUSION

20 The Second Motion is procedurally flawed. It seeks to bootstrap SELCO, a party
21 unrelated to the current litigation, into a costly ADR process without following due process
22 of law and without establishing jurisdiction. In addition, LBHI fails to produce even a
23 single piece of admissible evidence to support its conclusions that SELCO is a successor in
24

25 **Page 10 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.’S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

1 interest to a named party, instead relying on unsubstantiated and bald assertions to force a
2 stranger to this controversy to fly a representative across the country and “share” in the
3 costs of the ADR process. It would be highly inequitable to force SELCO to participate
4 and pay for mediation for a case to which it is not a party and has no knowledge enough to
5 negotiate a settlement based on an indemnification agreement to which SELCO was never
6 a party. Additionally, allowing the Second Motion would effectively switch the burden of
7 proof from requiring LBHI to show SELCO is a successor in interest, to forcing SELCO to
8 prove that it is not in costly mediation.
9

10
11 **WHEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, SELCO respectfully requests**
12 that the Court deny LBHI’s Second Motion which would require SELCO to participate in
13 mandatory ADR, and refrain from enforcing the July 18, 2014 ADR Order against SELCO.
14 In the alternative, SELCO requests that the Court define “Successors” as it applies to the
15 Second motion to exclude SELCO from that definition.
16

17 Respectfully submitted this 3rd day of May, 2016
18

19 /s/ Eric J. Kiley
20

21 Eric J. Kiley, OSB #025802
22 299 East 11th Avenue
P.O. Box 7487
Springfield, OR 97475-0487
Telephone: (541) 686-5356
Facsimile: (541) 686-5356
ekiley@selco.org
Of Attorneys for SELCO
Community Credit Union
23
24

25 **Page 11 of 11 OBJECTION TO LEHMAN BROTHERS HOLDINGS INC.’S SECOND MOTION IN AID OF
ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCEDURES ORDER FOR INDEMNIFICATION CLAIMS
OF THE DEBTORS AGAINST MORTGAGE LOAN SELLERS**

Steven L. McIntire-General Counsel
Eric J. Kiley-Associate General Counsel – ekiley@selco.org
Telephone/Facsimile: (541) 686-5356
PO Box 7487
Springfield, OR 97475-0487